3rd November 1933]

15. *Resignation.*—No member of the Service and no probationer or officer officiating in the Service shall resign the Service without the previous sanction of the Local Government.

16. *Leave, leave salary, pension and other conditions of service.*—The Fundamental Rules and the Pension Rules issued from time to time under the authority of the Government of Madras shall govern the members of the Service in the matter of leave, leave salary, pension and other conditions of service.

ANNEXURE (referred to in rule 5).

Indian Universities.

The Universities of Allahabad, Bombay, Calcutta, Dacca, Delhi, Lucknow, Madras, Nagpur, Patna, the Punjab and Rangoon.

The Aligarh Muslim University.
The Andhra University.
The Annamalai University.
The Benares Hindu University.
The Mysore University.
The Osmania University.

English and Welsh Universities.

The Universities of Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Durham, Leeds, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Oxford, Sheffield and Wales.

Scottish Universities.

The Universities of Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Glasgow and St. Andrews.

Irish Universities.

The University of Dublin (Trinity College) and the Queen's University of Belfast.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 307 asked by Mr. M. Devadasan at the meeting of the Legislative Council, held on the 3rd November 1933, page 405 supra.]

Copy of a memorial from the Adi-Dravida residents of Valliyoor, Nangunery taluk, Tinnevelly district, dated 25th June 1933.

That we, the undersigned, most humbly bring to your kind notice the following facts for your sympathetic consideration and prompt and favourable action:—

Recently a panchayat court was ordered to be constituted for the two revenue villages of Vadakku and Thekku Valliyoor. A considerable section of the population of the villages belongs to the class of

[3rd November 1933

the petitioners. Relying upon the strength of our voting population living in these two villages, we put up two of our men to contest in the election for two seats out of eleven fixed for the panchayat court, the candidates being one Michael and Shanmugam.

2. So far as Michael was concerned, he was not fully qualified inasmuch as he could not read and write though he could sign. As regards Shanmugam, it has to be stated that he was qualified in every respect. He owns land in his own right as well as a member of the joint Hindu family which pays a beriz of Rs. 18–5–0. On the 18th of March 1932 when the election of the members of the panchayat court took place, Shanmugam offered himself as a candidate for one of the seats of the panchayat court. On his behalf a representation was made by his father Esakkimuthu that he was willing to allow his son to contest a seat in the name of his family. The Deputy Tahsildar of Radhapuram, who was the election officer was pleased to record a statement to that effect and accept Shanmugam as a candidate as possessing necessary qualifications. Even as early as December 1931 an application was made by the father of Shanmugam for the transfer of his patta in favour of said Shanmugam. It appears that the Deputy Tahsildar had not passed any order on the said application. No objection was raised to the candidature of Shanmugam in the election meeting held on 18th March 1932, but on account of the commotion made by one Sundaram Ayyar, the election was not pushed through.

3. On 31st March 1932, the election of the panchayat court was held under the same election officer. Mr. Sundaram Ayyar raised objection that Shanmugam had not the necessary property qualification and that the Hindu Law did not apply to him. The Deputy Tahsildar having once accepted Shanmugam as eligible to stand as candidate in the meeting that took place on 18th March 1932, had not the boldness and goodness to overrule the objection. Similar objections were raised against (1) Suba Asari, (2) Rama Subu Tevan, (3) Rajagopal Muppan, (4) Shanmugam Pillai, (5) Velayutha Tevan, (6) Sivasubramania Tevan and (7) Omapathi Sivanu Tevan at the election, but they were all overruled by the election officer and we came away in disappointment not taking part in the election. Of the members mentioned above all were returned except No. 7 Omapathi Sivanu Tevan. In the case of 1 to 4 pattas were sought to be transferred to them from other persons on the eve of the election while they had no property of their own. In the case of No. 5 Velayutha Tevan it is to be said that he was paying a beriz of Rs. 4–4–0 to the Government and that a lease deed was executed on 17th March 1932 by him in favour of one Veeramony Ayyar only for the purpose of rendering him eligible to contest a seat on 18th March 1932. In the case of Subramania Pandiyan who was also a successful candidate, it has to be said that he had no property of his own. He was allowed to stand because of the fact that his father was an influential and rich man of the locality. In the case of the majority of the successful members of the panchayat court, pattas were issued to them on the 13th April 1932 at the time of Jamabandi.

3rd November 1933]

These new pattas which were issued by the Divisional Officer were produced before the same Divisional Officer on 15th April 1932 when the objection petition was heard.

4. Shanmugam and others presented objection petitions before the Divisional Officer at Shermadevi against the election, but to our great disappointment they were dismissed. The Divisional Officer, Shermadevi, says in his order as against Shanmugam that majority of his family did not authorize him to stand as a candidate under rule 5 of the rules for the election of members. The family of Shanmugam consists of three members including him. The father who was the manager of the family had given his entire consent for Shanmugam to stand. The brother of Shanmugam who is the third member need not give his consent for Shanmugam to stand, because he was in a minority against Shanmugam and his father, and another fact is that he was 16 years old only. So much so that it was unnecessary to secure his consent. So the order of the Sub-Collector passed against Shanmugam is against law and facts.

5. The majority of the members of the panchayat court had no right to stand as candidates and the procedure that was adopted in the election from beginning to end was fraudulent (38 Calcutta, 501 and 508), improper and unjust and the election was a farce and a sham transaction. We the Adi-Dravidas are deeply grieved over the fact that our candidate was not allowed to contest a seat while others who had no right to stand were permitted to stand in the election. The people of Thekku Valliyoor opposed the amalgamation of the two villages under one panchayat court and they neither participated in the election nor returned any member from among them to the said panchayat court.

6. The panchayat court as constituted at present consists of eleven members of whom five are Maravas and the rest being of other high castemen. The panchayat court is often being used in the past as an engine of oppression against us; several false cases both civil and criminal, were foisted upon us and we could not successfully defend ourselves in the court. In the name of law injustice is done to us. Our experience in the past has led us to believe that we cannot expect any justice from the court monopolized by caste prejudice against us.

7. The records will show that the election was held in the most irresponsible and unjust manner and in the interests of justice, equity and good conscience it is absolutely necessary that the election should be set aside the panchayat court dissolved and a fresh election take place. If this cannot be done, we submit that the court should be abolished for ever and the jurisdiction of the place should be transferred to the District Munsif and Sub-Magistrate.

8. We most humbly pray that your honour may be graciously pleased to issue order directing the dissolution of the present panchayat court and the holding of fresh election. We further request that in the alternative the jurisdiction of this place may be transferred to the higher tribunals.